

## Exhibit B

Rodney David Oliver  
11074 Oso Avenue  
Chatsworth, CA 91311  
rodneyolivermusic@gmail.com

June 13, 2025

VIA EMAIL

Dorothy M. Weber, Esq.  
Herbsman Hafer Weber & Frisch, LLP  
494 Eighth Avenue, Sixth Floor  
New York, NY 10001  
dorothy@musiclaw.com

Re: The Barry White Family Trust v. Cooley et al., Case No. 24-cv-07509 (DLC)  
Deficiency in Plaintiffs' Discovery Responses

Dear Ms. Weber:

After reviewing Plaintiffs' responses to Defendants' First Set of Interrogatories and First Request for the Production of Documents, I write to raise several deficiencies and seek clarification in good faith, as required by Rule 37(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

#### Interrogatories

##### 1. General Objections Without Substantive Answers

In several responses, Plaintiffs assert general objections (e.g., "overbroad," "vague," "not proportional") but do not provide any substantive answer. As required by Rule 33(b)(3), each interrogatory must be answered separately and fully to the extent not objected to.

##### 2. Failure to Provide Factual Details

Key interrogatories requesting factual information—such as those involving the authorship, ownership, and licensing of the allegedly infringed work—were either answered with conclusory statements or deferred without commitment to supplement. Please clarify whether complete answers will be provided and when.

### 3. Lack of Commitment to Supplement

In several instances, Plaintiffs respond that they will “supplement if necessary” or “reserve the right to supplement.” This language is insufficient. Please identify specifically whether responsive information exists and, if so, when it will be disclosed.

### Requests for Production

#### 1. Conditional Production Based on Necole Key

Plaintiffs have refused to produce discovery materials unless Ms. Necole Key signs the Protective Order acknowledgment, despite the fact that I—the named party—am entitled to review protected documents under Dkt. 102. Please confirm that you will produce the documents directly to me for initial review as required.

#### 2. No Identification of Documents Withheld

If any documents are being withheld on the basis of privilege or objection, a privilege log should be provided as required under Rule 26(b)(5).

#### 3. Non-Responsiveness to Document Categories

Several requests appear to have been ignored entirely or responded to with vague objections. Please confirm whether responsive documents exist and whether they will be produced.

I am making this request in good faith and am willing to confer further if needed. If I do not receive clarification or supplementation within 10 days, I may seek appropriate relief from the Court under Rule 37.

Sincerely,

Rodney D. Oliver  
Defendant, pro se